IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

WEDNESDAY, THE 10TH JANUARY 2007 / 20TH PAUSHA 1928

RP.No. 98 of 2006(H)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.1123/2006 dt.13.01.2006
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN WRIT PETITION:

ABRAHAM C.M., S/O. MATHAI,
CHUNDANKUZHIYIL HOUSE, KULAPPARACHAL P.O.,
POOPARA, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.N.K.SUBRAMANIAN
SRI.S.ANANTHAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3 IN WRIT PETITION:
----

1. **KERALA STATE FINANCIAL CORPORATION,**
   REPRESENTED BY THE BRANCH MANAGER, KATTAPPANA.

2. **C.M. JOSE, S/O. MATHAI,**
   CHUNDANKUZHIYIL HOUSE, KULAPPARACHAL P.O.,
   POOPARA, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

3. **C.M. VARGHESE (ALIAS MATHAI VARGHESE),**
   CHUNDANKUZHIYIL HOUSE, KULAPPARACHAL P.O.,
   POOPARA, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.V.B.UNNIRAJ, SC, KFC

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 10/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

R.P. NO.98/2006 IN

W.P.(C) NO. 1123/2006-H

ORDER

The petitioner seeks review of the judgment as the writ petition happened to be dismissed because of the production of a wrong pattayam, which has nothing to do with the property sought to be sold in public auction as per Ext.P5. If that be so, I feel that the proper remedy for the petitioner is to file a fresh writ petition, producing the correct documents. Without prejudice to that right, this R.P is closed. It is made clear that the judgment under review will not operate as a bar in raising all the contentions of the petitioner against Ext.P5.

10th January, 2007. K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.

Nm/